UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,409	09/20/2006	Rudolf Pachl	9134-0414	3752
	7590 08/11/201 NEY & EVANS LLP	EXAMINER		
111 Monument	Circle	ALEXANDER, LYLE		
Suite 2700 INDIANAPOL	IS, IN 46204	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1773	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MBARTOL@BOSELAW.COM patent@boselaw.com bgibbs@boselaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/581,409	PACHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LYLE ALEXANDER	1773	

	LYLE ALEXANDER	1773						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c	nsideration and/or search (see NOT N); eer form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying th						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1.24. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.25. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Con owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 22-36 and 40-42. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	planation of					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•						
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/ Lyle Alexander/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1773						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to method claims 40 and 42 have not been previously considered and would require further search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant state the "whereby" clause in claim 22 has not been given the appropriate weight by the Office. The Office maintains the pending apparatus claims have been evaluated for their structural features. The cited prior art meets all of the claimed structural requirements and would inherently have the same hydrophibic properties.

Continuation of 13. Other: The 8/1/11 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration is not convincing because it is not commensurate in scope with the pending claims. Specifically, the Declaration on page 3 paragraph "b" states the test device was "coated on the outside with a lotus effect spay". It is not clear what claimed structural element corresponds to the "spray" and what is in the spray. Additionally, the claims state the surface comprises "elevations and depressions" ranging between 50nm-100 microns. These structural features are not described in the Declaration. Applicant should consider a Declaration that compares a surface with the claimed 50nm-100 micron texturing with a surface that has a different texturing.